

UNIONS OF ARCS FROM FOURIER PARTIAL SUMS

DENNIS COURTNEY

ABSTRACT. Elementary complex analysis and Hilbert space methods show that a union of at most n arcs on the circle is uniquely determined by the n th Fourier partial sum of its characteristic function. The endpoints of the arcs can be recovered from the coefficients appearing in the partial sum by solving two polynomial equations.

We let $\mathbb{T} = \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| = 1\}$ and $\mathbb{D} = \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| < 1\}$, and for any subset E of $\mathbb{T}$ and integer k we write

$$\widehat{E}(k) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_E e^{-ikt} dt$$

for the k th Fourier coefficient of the characteristic function χ_E of E . As bounded functions with the same sequence of Fourier coefficients agree almost everywhere, any subset E of $\mathbb{T}$ is determined up to a set of measure zero by the sequence $\widehat{E}(k)$. If E is known to have additional structure, the entire sequence may not be needed to recover E . Our present subject is a simple yet nontrivial illustration of this principle.

An *arc* is by definition a closed, connected, proper and nonempty subset of $\mathbb{T}$. We declare $\mathbb{T}$ along with the empty set to be a “union of 0 arcs.”

Theorem 1. *If n is a nonnegative integer and E_1 and E_2 are unions of at most n arcs satisfying*

$$(1) \quad \widehat{E_1}(k) = \widehat{E_2}(k), \quad 0 \leq k \leq n,$$

then $E_1 = E_2$.

Thus a set E that is known to be a union of at most n arcs can be recovered *completely* from the n th Fourier partial sum of χ_E , regardless of any quantitative sense in which this partial sum fails to approximate χ_E . This stands in slight contrast to the well-known defects of Fourier partial sum approximation of functions with jump discontinuities, such as the Gibbs phenomenon (see e.g. [4, Chapter 17]). Significantly, the property of the Fourier basis expressed by Theorem 1 is not shared by other orthonormal systems of functions on $\mathbb{T}$ (see §3).

Our proof of Theorem 1 exploits a connection between unions of arcs and certain rational functions—the *Blaschke products*, whose properties we recall in §1. Each Blaschke product has a nonnegative integer *order*. In §2 we construct an injection $E \mapsto b_E$ from the set of finite unions of arcs to the set of Blaschke products with the property that if E is a union of at most n arcs, then b_E has order at most n . This map has the property that if E_1 and E_2 satisfy (1), then b_{E_1} and b_{E_2} have

Date: March 3, 2010.

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary: 42A16, 46N99.

The author was partially supported by the University of Iowa Department of Mathematics NSF VIGRE grant DMS-0602242.

the same n th order Taylor polynomial at 0. To prove Theorem 1 it then suffices to note, as we do in §3, how a Blaschke product of order at most n is determined by its n th order Taylor polynomial.

With Theorem 1 in hand, one may ask how to recover E from a partial list of Fourier coefficients in an explicit fashion. This is the subject of §4, where we present an algorithm for testing whether or not a given tuple of complex numbers takes the form $(\widehat{E}(k))_{k=0}^n$ for a union E of at most n arcs, and for finding the endpoints of these arcs in terms of the Fourier coefficients in this case.

Perhaps because of its elementary nature, we have not found Theorem 1 explicitly stated in the literature, although it is known, and the literature abounds with more general theorems on the reconstruction of a function from partial knowledge of its Fourier transform. In [6] it is shown that a function on $\mathbb{T}$ that is piecewise constant on a partition of $\mathbb{T}$ into m connected pieces may be recovered from its m th Fourier partial sum. Note that Theorem 1 concludes slightly more from a much stronger hypothesis.

The argument we use is known to specialists. The basic idea is to apply a conformal map into the disc and then the classical Caratheodory-Fejer theorem [1]. This is by no means the only approach to Theorem 1. It should be contrasted with what one may get by viewing (1) as a system of polynomial equations and solving it directly with algebra.

We are indebted to Donald Sarason for many valuable discussions, and to Mihalis Kolountzakis for drawing our attention to [6].

1. BLASCHKE PRODUCTS

Definition. A (finite) Blaschke product is a function of the form

$$(2) \quad b(z) = \lambda \prod_{j=1}^n \frac{z - a_j}{1 - \overline{a_j}z}$$

for some nonnegative integer n , some $\lambda \in \mathbb{T}$, and some $a_1, \dots, a_n \in \mathbb{D}$. The nonnegative integer n is called the order of the Blaschke product.

If $n = 0$ we interpret the empty product as 1. The domain of a Blaschke product is either $\mathbb{T}$, $\mathbb{D}$, or the closure $\overline{\mathbb{D}}$ of $\mathbb{D}$, depending on context. A Blaschke product is evidently a rational function that maps $\mathbb{T}$ to itself and has no poles in $\mathbb{D}$ (it suffices to check the case $n = 1$). It is well known that these properties characterize the Blaschke products.

Proposition 1. If a rational function r maps $\mathbb{T}$ to itself and has no poles in $\mathbb{D}$, then it is a Blaschke product of order equal to the number n of zeros of r in $\mathbb{D}$, counted according to multiplicity.

Proof. We induct on n . If $n = 0$, then $r = q^{-1}$ for some polynomial q ; write $q(z) = \sum_{k=0}^m q_k z^k$ with $q_m \neq 0$. As $q(\mathbb{T}) \subseteq \mathbb{T}$ we have

$$q(z)^{-1} = \overline{q(z)} = \overline{q(\overline{z}^{-1})} = \sum_{k=0}^m \overline{q_k} z^{-k} = \frac{\sum_{k=0}^m \overline{q_k} z^{m-k}}{z^m}, \quad z \in \mathbb{T},$$

so this holds for all nonzero $z \in \mathbb{D}$. As q has no zeros in $\mathbb{D}$, the extreme right hand side has no pole at 0; thus $m = 0$ and q is constant as desired.

If r has $n + 1$ zeros in $\mathbb{D}$, choose one, a , and note that $r(z) \cdot (\frac{z-a}{1-\overline{a}z})^{-1}$ has n zeros in $\mathbb{D}$ and maps $\mathbb{T}$ to itself. $\square$

Definition. If b is a Blaschke product, we let $U_b = \{z \in \mathbb{T} : \operatorname{Im} z \geq 0\}$.

If the zeros of a Blaschke product are $a_1, \dots, a_n$, we calculate from (2)

$$\frac{zb'(z)}{b(z)} = \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{1 - |a_j|^2}{|z - a_j|^2} > 0, \quad z \in \mathbb{T},$$

so the argument of $b(e^{it})$ is strictly increasing in t . The argument principle implies that $b(e^{it})$ travels n times counterclockwise around $\mathbb{T}$ as t runs from 0 to 2π .

Corollary 1. A Blaschke product b has order n if and only if U_b is a disjoint union of n arcs.

This is the main reason we include $\mathbb{T}$ as a “union of 0 arcs.”

2. BLASCHKE PRODUCTS FROM UNIONS OF ARCS

Let $S = \{z \in \mathbb{C} : 0 \leq 2 \operatorname{Re} z \leq 1\}$ and let ϕ denote the function

$$\phi(z) = \frac{\exp(2\pi i(z - 1/4)) - 1}{\exp(2\pi i(z - 1/4)) + 1}.$$

It is easy to show (see e.g. [2, §III.3]) that ϕ maps S bijectively onto $\overline{\mathbb{D}} \setminus \{\pm 1\}$, that ϕ restricts to an analytic bijection of the interior of S with $\mathbb{D}$, that ϕ maps the right boundary line of S onto $\{z \in \mathbb{T} : \operatorname{Im} z > 0\}$, and that ϕ maps the left boundary line of S onto $\{z \in \mathbb{T} : \operatorname{Im} z < 0\}$.

Proposition 2. If E is a disjoint union of $n \geq 0$ arcs and h_E is given by

$$(3) \quad h_E(z) = \frac{1}{2} \hat{E}(0) + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \hat{E}(k) z^k, \quad z \in \mathbb{D},$$

then h_E is an analytic map of $\mathbb{D}$ into S , and the function $\mathbb{D} \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{D}}$ given by

$$b_E = \phi \circ h_E$$

extends uniquely to a Blaschke product $\overline{\mathbb{D}} \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{D}}$ of order n satisfying $U_{b_E} = E$.

Using the formulas for ϕ and h_E one can show without much work that b_E is a rational function; the work in proving Proposition 2 is to establish that b_E has the mapping properties of Proposition 1, and hence is a Blaschke product, and to prove that $U_{b_E} = E$.

To motivate the argument, let us work nonrigorously for a moment. Formally we have the series expansion

$$(4) \quad \chi_E(z) = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \hat{E}(k) z^k, \quad z \in \mathbb{T},$$

and formal manipulation of the series (3) with $z \in \mathbb{T}$ then shows that

$$\chi_E(z) = h_E(z) + \overline{h_E(z)} = 2 \operatorname{Re} h_E(z), \quad z \in \mathbb{T}.$$

As χ_E is $\{0, 1\}$ valued on $\mathbb{T}$, the maximum principle for harmonic functions then implies that h_E maps $\mathbb{D}$ into S , so $b_E = \phi \circ h_E$ maps $\overline{\mathbb{D}}$ into $\overline{\mathbb{D}}$ and sends the circle to itself. By Proposition 1 it follows that b_E is a Blaschke product; the equality $U_{b_E} = E$ comes from the mapping properties of ϕ on the boundary of S .

What makes this argument nonrigorous is that the series (4) does not converge for all $z \in \mathbb{T}$, and to equate χ_E with $2 \operatorname{Re} h_E$ is to ignore the distinction between

a discontinuous real valued function on $\mathbb{T}$ and a harmonic function on $\mathbb{D}$. To fill in these gaps, we need to use the actual connection between $2 \operatorname{Re} h_E$ and χ_E —the former is the Poisson integral of the latter.

Proof. It is easily checked that (3) does define an analytic function on $\mathbb{D}$, e.g. because $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} |\widehat{E}(k)|^2$ is convergent. One can then verify the identity

$$2h_E(z) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{1 + ze^{-is}}{1 - ze^{-is}} \chi_E(e^{is}) ds, \quad z \in \mathbb{D}.$$

(Fix z , expand $\frac{1}{1 - ze^{-is}}$ as a power series in z and interchange the sum and the integral.) Taking real parts it follows that for any $r \in [0, 1)$ and any t

$$(5) \quad 2 \operatorname{Re} h_E(re^{it}) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} P_r(t - s) \chi_E(e^{is}) ds,$$

where

$$P_r(t) = \operatorname{Re} \left(\frac{1 + re^{it}}{1 - re^{it}} \right)$$

is the *Poisson kernel*. It is elementary (see e.g. [2, §X.2]) that for $r \in [0, 1)$ the function P_r is nonnegative and satisfies $\frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} P_r(\theta) d\theta = 1$; thus (5) implies that $2 \operatorname{Re} h_E(z) \in [0, 1]$ for all $z \in \mathbb{D}$, and h_E maps $\mathbb{D}$ into S .

As r increases to 1, the P_r converge uniformly to the zero function on the complement of any neighborhood of 0 (see e.g. [2, §X.2]). From (5) we conclude

$$(6) \quad \lim_{r \uparrow 1} 2 \operatorname{Re} h_E(rz) = \chi_E(z)$$

at any $z \in \mathbb{T}$ at which χ_E is continuous. We conclude that for any such z the limit $\lim_{r \uparrow 1} (\phi \circ h_E)(rz)$ exists and is in $\mathbb{T}$.

We claim that $\phi \circ h_E$ is a rational function. In the case $n = 0$ this is clear. Otherwise, from the definition of ϕ it suffices to show that $\exp(2\pi i h_E)$ is a rational function, and for this it suffices to treat the case $n = 1$. In this case there are real numbers $a < b$ with $b - a < 2\pi$ satisfying $E = \{e^{it} : t \in [a, b]\}$, and $\widehat{E}(k) = \frac{\exp(-ikb) - \exp(-ika)}{-2\pi ik}$ for all $k > 0$. Let $\log$ denote the analytic logarithm defined on $\mathbb{C} \setminus \{z \in \mathbb{C} : z \leq 0\}$ that is real on the positive real axis and recall that $\log(1 - z) = -\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{z^k}{k}$ for all $z \in \mathbb{D}$. A comparison of power series shows

$$h_E(z) = \frac{b - a}{4\pi} + \frac{1}{2\pi i} (\log(1 - e^{-ib}z) - \log(1 - e^{-ia}z)), \quad z \in \mathbb{D},$$

so $\exp(2\pi i h_E) = \exp(i \frac{b-a}{2}) \frac{1 - e^{-ib}z}{1 - e^{-ia}z}$ is rational.

At this point we know that $b_E = \phi \circ h_E$ is a rational function mapping $\mathbb{D}$ into itself. From (6) we deduce that b_E maps $\mathbb{T}$ into itself, so b_E is a Blaschke product by Proposition 1. The equality $U_{b_E} = E$ then follows from (6). The order of b_E is n by Corollary 1. $\square$

If E_1 and E_2 are two unions of arcs related by (1), it is clear from the definition that h_{E_1} and h_{E_2} have the same n th order Taylor polynomial at 0. As ϕ is analytic at 0, the same is true of b_{E_1} and b_{E_2} .

Corollary 2. *If $n \geq 0$ and E_1 and E_2 are each unions of at most n arcs satisfying*

$$(7) \quad \widehat{E}_1(k) = \widehat{E}_2(k), \quad 0 \leq k \leq n,$$

then there are Blaschke products b_1 and b_2 , each of order at most n , satisfying $E_j = U_{b_j}$ for $j = 1, 2$ and

$$(8) \quad \widehat{b}_1(k) = \widehat{b}_2(k), \quad 0 \leq k \leq n.$$

3. BLASCHKE PRODUCTS FROM TOEPLITZ MATRICES

Fix a positive integer n for the remainder of this section. Our goal is to show that Blaschke products b_1 and b_2 having order at most n and satisfying (8) must be equal. Let L^2 denote the space of square-integrable functions $\mathbb{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$, with inner product

$$\langle f, g \rangle = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} f(e^{it}) \overline{g(e^{it})} dt, \quad f, g \in L^2.$$

(We identify two functions if they agree almost everywhere.)

For $0 \leq k \leq n$ we let ζ^k denote the function $\mathbb{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ given by $z \mapsto z^k$. It is immediate that $\{\zeta^k : 0 \leq k \leq n\}$ is an orthonormal subset of L^2 . We denote its span, the space of analytic polynomials of degree at most n , by P ; we let $\pi : L^2 \rightarrow P$ denote the orthogonal projection.

Definition. If $f : \mathbb{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is bounded, $T_f : P \rightarrow P$ denotes the linear map given by

$$T_f \xi = \pi(f\xi), \quad \xi \in P.$$

Here $f\xi$ is the pointwise product of f and ξ .

If we let $\|T_f\|$ denote the norm of T_f regarded as a linear operator on P and write $\|f\|_\infty = \sup_{z \in \mathbb{T}} |f(z)|$, it is clear that

$$\|T_f\| \leq \|f\|_\infty$$

for any bounded f . It is also clear that for any such f

$$\langle T_f \zeta^k, \zeta^j \rangle = \widehat{f}(j - k), \quad 0 \leq j, k \leq n,$$

so the matrix of T_f with respect to the orthonormal basis $\{\zeta^k : 0 \leq k \leq n\}$ is constant along its diagonals (it is a *Toeplitz matrix*).

If f is a Blaschke product, then f is analytic on $\overline{\mathbb{D}}$, so the matrix of T_f is lower triangular with first column $(\widehat{f}(k))_{k=0}^n$. Our hypothesis (8) is thus that $T_{b_1} = T_{b_2}$, and to deduce that $b_1 = b_2$ it suffices to show how to recover a Blaschke product b of order at most n from the operator T_b it induces on P .

Lemma 1. *If b is a Blaschke product of order at most n , then $\|T_b\| = 1$, and for any nonzero $r \in P$ satisfying $\|T_b r\| = \|r\|$ one has $T_b r = br$.*

This proof is a special case of the proof of [5, Proposition 5.1].

Proof. There are nonzero polynomials p and q , each of degree at most n , satisfying $b = p/q$. Clearly $T_b q = p$, and as b maps $\mathbb{T}$ to itself, we have $|p(z)| = |q(z)|$ for all $z \in \mathbb{T}$, so $\|p\| = \|q\|$. We deduce that $\|T_b q\| = \|q\|$ and thus $\|T_b\| \geq 1$; since also $\|T_b\| \leq \|b\|_\infty = 1$, we conclude $\|T_b\| = 1$.

If $r \in P$ satisfies $\|T_b r\| = \|r\|$ we have

$$\|r\|^2 = \|T_b r\|^2 = \|\pi(br)\|^2 \leq \|br\|^2 = \int_0^{2\pi} |b(e^{it})|^2 |r(e^{it})|^2 dt = \|r\|^2,$$

from which $\|\pi(br)\| = \|br\|$ and thus $\pi(br) = br$ as desired. $\square$

Remark 1. *The argument of Lemma 1 can be modified to show that if f is bounded and analytic on $\overline{\mathbb{D}}$ and $\|f\|_\infty = 1$, then $\|T_f\| \leq 1$ with equality if and only if f is a Blaschke product of order at most n . With more work, one can prove the rest of the classical Caratheodory-Fejer theorem: that every lower triangular $(n+1) \times (n+1)$ Toeplitz M satisfying $\|M\| = 1$ is of the form T_f for such an f .*

We can now prove Theorem 1.

Proof of Theorem 1. By Corollary 2 there are Blaschke products b_1 and b_2 of order at most n satisfying $U_{b_j} = E_j$ for $j = 1, 2$ and $\widehat{b_1}(k) = \widehat{b_2}(k)$ for $0 \leq k \leq n$. This second fact implies that $T_{b_1} = T_{b_2}$. By Lemma 1 there is nonzero $q \in P$ satisfying $\|T_{b_1}q\| = \|T_{b_2}q\| = \|q\|$ and

$$b_1 = \frac{T_{b_1}q}{q} = \frac{T_{b_2}q}{q} = b_2,$$

so $E_1 = U_{b_1} = U_{b_2} = E_2$. □

As the Fourier coefficients of a bounded function are coefficients with respect to an orthonormal basis of the Hilbert space L^2 , one might wonder if Theorem 1 is a special case of a simpler result about arbitrary orthonormal bases of L^2 . This is not the case. There are, for example, orthonormal bases B for L^2 with the property that for every finite subset $F \subseteq B$, there is an arc A with the property that every element of F is constant on A . (The basis $(e^{2\pi it} \mapsto f(t))_{f \in H}$, where H is the Haar basis of $L^2[0, 1]$ constructed in [3, §III.1], has this property.) In this situation, if $E \subseteq A$ and $E' \subseteq A$ are any two unions of arcs with the same total measure, one will have $\langle \chi_E, f \rangle = \langle \chi_{E'}, f \rangle$ for all $f \in F$: any finite collection of coefficients with respect to B must fail to distinguish infinitely many unions of n arcs from one another.

4. AN ALGORITHM

Let $\mathcal{F}$ denote the map sending a union of at most n arcs E to the tuple $(\widehat{E}(k))_{k=0}^n$ in $\mathbb{C}^{n+1}$. Suppose $c = (c_k)_{k=0}^n$ is given, and we desire to know whether or not c is in the range of $\mathcal{F}$. The arguments of the previous sections give us the following procedure. (We use the orthonormal basis of §3 to identify linear operators on P with $(n+1) \times (n+1)$ matrices.)

- (1) Calculate the n th Taylor polynomial at 0 for $\phi(\frac{c_0}{2} + \sum_{k=1}^n c_k z^k)$, and make its coefficients the first column of a lower-triangular Toeplitz matrix M .
- (2) Evaluate $\|M\|$.
If $\|M\| \neq 1$, then c is not in the range of $\mathcal{F}$.
- (3) Otherwise $\|M\| = 1$ and by the Caratheodory-Fejer theorem (see Remark 1) there is a unique Blaschke product f of order at most n satisfying $M = T_f$. Find $F = U_f$ (e.g. by solving $f(z) = \pm 1$ to get the endpoints of the arcs) and calculate the coefficients of the n th order Taylor polynomial at 0 for b_F .

If these coefficients are the first column of M then $b_F = f$ and $c = \mathcal{F}(F)$; otherwise c is not in the range of $\mathcal{F}$.

Remark 2. *The third step of the algorithm is necessary as the map $E \mapsto b_E$ from unions of n arcs to Blaschke products of order n is not surjective. One can check, for example, that of the Blaschke products $b_t(z) = \frac{z^n - t}{1 - \overline{t}z^n}$ for real $|t| < 1$, all of which satisfy $U_{b_t} = U_{b_0}$, only b_0 is in the range of $E \mapsto b_E$.*

If we know in advance that $c = \mathcal{F}(E)$ is in the range of $\mathcal{F}$, this algorithm can recover E from c in a somewhat explicit fashion. The matrix M constructed from c is T_{b_E} ; Lemma 1 implies that if we choose a nonzero $q \in P$ satisfying $\|Mq\| = \|q\|$, we will have $b_E = \frac{Mq}{q}$. If q is chosen so as to have minimal degree, the polynomials Mq and q will have no nontrivial common factors. In this case the degree of q is the order of b_E , and the endpoints of the arcs of E —the solutions to $b_E(z) = 1$ and $b_E(z) = -1$ —are the roots of the polynomials $Mq - q$ and $Mq + q$. A computer has no difficulty carrying out this procedure to find the arcs of E to any given precision from the tuple $c = \mathcal{F}(E)$.

As this algorithm involves solving polynomial equations, we cannot expect symbolic formulas for these endpoints of the arcs of E in terms of the Fourier coefficients $\widehat{E}(k)$. Formulas for the polynomials $Mq \pm q$, however, can be obtained with some effort. The entries of M are polynomials in $\exp(2\pi i \widehat{E}(0))$, $\widehat{E}(1)$, $\dots$, $\widehat{E}(n)$ with complex coefficients. As M has norm 1, a vector q will satisfy $\|Mq\| = \|q\|$ if and only if q is an eigenvector for the self-adjoint matrix M^*M corresponding to the eigenvalue 1; we can find such a q by using Gaussian elimination, for example. As the entries of M^*M are polynomials in the entries of M and their complex conjugates, the coefficients of q and $Mq \pm q$ will be rational functions in $\exp(2\pi i \widehat{E}(0))$, $\widehat{E}(1)$, $\dots$, $\widehat{E}(n)$ and their complex conjugates. Cases may arise in computing $Mq \pm q$ symbolically: in row reducing the symbolic matrix $M^*M - I$, one needs to know whether or not certain functions of the matrix entries are zero—but explicit formulas can be obtained in every case.

We give one example. Suppose that E is a union of at most two arcs, with $\widehat{E}(0)$, $\widehat{E}(1)$, and $\widehat{E}(2)$ given. Write $E_0 = \exp(2\pi i \widehat{E}(0))$ and $E_k = -2\pi i k \widehat{E}(k)$ for $k = 1, 2$. Carrying out the above procedure, one finds that if both E_1 and the denominator of

$$a = \frac{E_2 \overline{E_1} + 2E_1 - E_1^2 \overline{E_1} - 2E_1 E_0}{E_1^2 E_0 + E_2 E_0 - E_2 + E_1^2},$$

are nonzero, then the starting points of the arcs of E are the solutions z of the equation

$$z^2 - az + \left(\frac{\overline{E_1} + (1 - E_0)a}{E_1 E_0} \right) = 0.$$

The endpoints of the arcs of E are given by a similar formula.

REFERENCES

- [1] Constantin Carathéodory and Leopold Fejér, *Über den Zusammenhang der Extremen von harmonischen Funktionen mit ihren Koeffizienten und über den Picard-Laudau'schen Satz*, Rend. Circ. Mat. Palermo **32** (1911), 218–239.
- [2] John B. Conway, *Functions of one complex variable*, second ed., Graduate Texts in Mathematics, vol. 11, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1978.
- [3] Alfred Haar, *Zur Theorie der orthogonalen Funktionensysteme*, Math. Ann. **69** (1910), no. 3, 331–371.
- [4] T. W. Körner, *Fourier analysis*, second ed., Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1989.
- [5] Donald Sarason, *Generalized interpolation in H^∞* , Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **127** (1967), 179–203.
- [6] Martin Vetterli, Pina Marziliano, and Thierry Blu, *Sampling signals with finite rate of innovation*, IEEE Trans. Signal Process. **50** (2002), no. 6, 1417–1428.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF IOWA, IOWA CITY, IA 52242
E-mail address: dennis-courtney@uiowa.edu